

□ 1715

The President and the Members of Congress here identified the source of that problem. It was al Qaeda network being harbored by the Taliban in Afghanistan, and we all united together to make sure that that problem was eliminated. Some of us even went to Afghanistan to be with our military personnel to show them our support for the efforts there. That military action is over. Unfortunately, due to the lack of attention of the administration, however, it is rapidly deteriorating.

But I want to talk more about the situation that exists in Iraq because that has become the major focus of our attention, and indeed it has taken on a partisan perspective, and there are very good reasons for that because we have major differences of opinion. First of all, with regard to the rationale for attacking Iraq and, secondly, with regard to how the circumstances there are being carried out by this administration and especially by the Defense Department under this administration.

Everyone will recall that the President, when he spoke here in this House to a joint session of Congress and the American people, said over and over and over again directly and indirectly that there were ties and relationships between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, between Iraq and the al Qaeda network, and that was the reason why we had to go to war. Just recently the President has had to admit that that was not the case. There was no connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda or Osama bin Laden.

Then the administration was telling us that they had to go over weapons of mass destruction. They knew there were chemical and biological weapons there in Iraq, and we had to go in there because those weapons were dangerous and they had to be taken care of. We have been there now for 5 months. We have found no chemical or biological weapons, no trace of any program dealing with nuclear weapons in spite of the fact that the President, from the podium here in this House, said that he had good solid information that the Iraqis were importing enriched uranium from Niger to facilitate the development of their nuclear program. All of that has turned out to be false. And so, yes, we raised the question why did we go to Iraq? For what purpose are we there? Why did we disrupt that country? Why have we created a situation of chaos there that has resulted in the death, up to this moment, of more than 300 American soldiers and the injury, the wounding, many of them very serious, of hundreds more, not to mention the deaths of tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and others from other countries? Yes, we question that.

Now, we find out other things. For example, we have learned recently that there are now, according to General Abizaid, who is the highest-ranking American military officer in the Persian Gulf, that there are 650,000 tons of

conventional weapons in Iraq, and they are essentially unguarded. The administration is running around the country there looking for so-called weapons of mass destruction. They have not paid a bit of attention to 650,000 tons of conventional weapons, grenades, surface-to-air missiles, 500-pound bombs, things of that nature that are scattered in places all over that country.

The destruction of the UN headquarters in Iraq recently, which resulted in the death of the highest-ranking United Nations official in Iraq, is something that we are all deeply concerned about and lament. What caused that? It turns out that under an FBI investigation, they found remnants of a Russian-made 500-pound bomb that, in all likelihood, came from one of these arsenals that are scattered around Iraq unguarded from which the terrorists can get all of the explosives and all of the conventional weapons they want, because we are not paying sufficient attention to them because we are looking for something that the administration has known from the beginning, based upon intelligence from the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and elsewhere, that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

They have taken us down a blind alley. We see through it. We see the falsehood. We see the mendacity. And, of course, we have an obligation, a responsibility to speak out against it. That is why the tone has turned in this House to a more partisan nature, because the administration and the leadership in this House pulled the wool over the eyes of the American people and many of the Members of this House who voted for that war resolution back last October. And now it is evident that they did so under false pretenses. It was a fraud, and we need to take action to correct it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 2003

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-290) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 3) to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RECEIPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I have on my desk a small card which has the words of my predecessor Congressman Ben Blaz. It says "I am a Member of Congress, but not one of its

Members." I read those words today, Madam Speaker, because I had them reinforced to me when I tried to sign the discharge petition here in Congress to give the veterans concurrent receipt that they deserve. We have veterans on Guam, 15,000 of them, in fact, but I was told as a Delegate, I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. More soldiers from Guam have died, per capita, in foreign wars than any other State in the Nation. But Madam Speaker, I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. Pacific Islander veterans suffer disproportionately from posttraumatic stress disorder, but I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 303, but I cannot put my name on that discharge petition.

What can I do? I have decided to come to the floor today to appeal to my colleagues. I urge them to sign the discharge petition, Republican or Democrat; it does not matter. Do it for the veterans in their district. Do it for the veterans of Guam. Do it for their colleague who has been denied that right. I appeal to my colleagues on behalf of the disabled veterans of America. I see them at town hall meetings in my district all the time, and it breaks my heart. Veterans like Mr. Victor Pangelinan Tabios, who is 100 percent disabled.

Madam Speaker, the people of Guam are shy people. It takes a lot of courage for them to stand up in public and to speak out their mind. So when Victor spoke to me about concurrent receipt, I listened. He served our country with duty and honor and pride, and now it is time for us to step up and do the same. If just one of my colleagues will sign that discharge petition today, they will have the deepest thanks from the people of Guam and a very grateful Delegate who cannot sign the petition.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to request to allow the gentlewoman to sign the discharge petition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the Chair will not entertain that request.

Mr. FILNER. Why is that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The respective rights and privileges of the Members and Delegates are established by rules and by law; so that unanimous consent request will not be entertained.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this up because this is an insult to her constituents, it is an insult to her. I will say if the Democrats get control of the House, the right to vote and sign discharge petitions, we hope, will get back to the delegates.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his interest and concern.